

REMARKS

Status Of Application

Claims 42-51 are pending in the application; the status of the claims is as follows:

Claims 45 and 49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,222,662 to Kruegle ("Kruegle").

Claims 42-44, 46-48, 50, and 51 are allowed.

Claim Amendments

Claims 45 and 49 have been amended to more specifically point out and distinctly claim the invention. These changes do not introduce any new matter.

35 U.S.C. § 102(b) Rejection

The rejection of claims 45 and 49 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Kruegle, is respectfully traversed based on the following.

Kruegle shows a system for reading hidden data in an ID card. A camera 31 extracts hidden data 16 and 17 from behind a filter 13b. The data 17 is decoded by scanning the encoding area and determining a digital signal, which is analyzed by a computer (col. 4, line 65 – col. 5, line 5; Figure 7).

In contrast to the cited references, claim 45 includes:

an extracting device which extracts a plurality of sets of additional data embedded in image data read by said reading device; and
a decision device which decides whether the image data is forged or not, by comparing at least one of the plurality of sets of additional data extracted by said extracting device with at least one other of the plurality of sets of additional data.

Kruegle extracts a single set of data 17. Each spot is a bit and cannot be considered a set. In addition, the comparison of the scanned information shown in Figure 7 is part of the process of extracting the data. This does not show or suggest any authentication process. There is no suggestion in the references of "comparing at least one of the plurality of sets of additional data extracted by said extracting device with at least one other of the plurality of sets of additional data." To anticipate, the cited reference must show, expressly or inherently, every limitation of the claim. Therefore, the cited references do not anticipate claim 45 and claim 45 is patentably distinct from the prior art.

Also in contrast to the cited references, claim 49 includes:

extracting a plurality of sets of additional data embedded in the read image data; and
deciding whether the image data is forged or not, by comparing at least one of the plurality of sets of extracted additional data with at least one other of the plurality of sets of extracted additional data.

As noted above with regard to claim 45, there is no suggestion in the cited references of "comparing at least one of the plurality of sets of extracted additional data with at least one other of the plurality of sets of extracted additional data." Therefore, the cited references do not anticipate claim 49 and claim 49 is patentably distinct from the prior art.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claims 45 and 49 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Kruegle, be reconsidered and withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

Wherefore, in view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, this application is considered to be in condition for allowance, and an early reconsideration and a Notice of Allowance are earnestly solicited.

This Amendment does not increase the number of independent claims, does not increase the total number of claims, and does not present any multiple dependency claims.

Application No. 10/728,541
Amendment dated May 7, 2007
Reply to Office Action of February 6, 2007


Accordingly, no fee based on the number or type of claims is currently due. However, if a fee, other than the issue fee, is due, please charge this fee to Sidley Austin LLP Deposit Account No. 18-1260.

If an extension of time is required to enable this document to be timely filed and there is no separate Petition for Extension of Time filed herewith, this document is to be construed as also constituting a Petition for Extension of Time Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) for a period of time sufficient to enable this document to be timely filed.

Any other fee required for such Petition for Extension of Time and any other fee required by this document pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 and 1.17, other than the issue fee, and not submitted herewith should be charged to Sidley Austin LLP Deposit Account No. 18-1260. Any refund should be credited to the same account.

Respectfully submitted,

By: _____


Douglas A. Sorensen
Registration No. 31,570
Attorney for Applicants

DAS/llb:bar
SIDLEY AUSTIN LLP
717 N. Harwood, Suite 3400
Dallas, Texas 75201
Direct: (214) 981-3482
Main: (214) 981-3300
Facsimile: (214) 981-3400
May 7, 2007